

Preliminary Questions for Navy/DLA following Initial Regulator review of TUA Supplemental
Draft 09.02.2021

Allow for discussion between each question. Comfortable with Peter moderating/facilitating this meeting.

Big picture questions

1. What is the basis and rationale for the 2045 target date for secondary containment?
2. Would the Navy consider integrating the commitment to secondary containment into the AOC?
3. Can the Navy briefly describe how each option scores against each criterion for BAPT?
4. 1A BAPT rationale focused on other five options being infeasible due to engineering challenges. How would these same engineering challenges be overcome by a future secondary containment option?
5. If a future secondary containment option is not selected, when will the Navy be developing a contingency plan for defueling by 2045?
6. Could the Navy provide an incremental schedule at five-year intervals from now to 2045 that describes plans for TUA, secondary containment, and potential defueling?
7. Will the water treatment plant still be built if the Navy is working toward secondary containment or defuel by 2045?

Technical questions

1. What is the expected operating life of the tanks?
2. Which tanks does this TUA 1A proposal apply to?
3. If 1A is approved, how would the current TIRM process change?
4. Describe the protocol for responding to each combination of alarms (for example, SVM and AFE alarms sound) within the system of systems? Does the Navy conduct audits that operators are unaware of to test operator response?
5. What are the criteria to evaluate the performance of tank coatings proposed in 1B (i.e. pressure, hole size, etc)?

Draft Talking Points

- Positives:
 - Document is an improvement from the first submission. Recognize a lot of work was put into the report.
 - Considerable work has been done since the AOC was established to improve the facility and operations.
 - TUA Supplemental helps communicate all the work that technical teams have done under the AOC.
 - We appreciate that the end goal is secondary containment or defuel.
- Issues:
 - We were hoping for a more robust analysis for why alternatives aren't feasible.
 - Lack of information sharing about the May 6th release and the GTTNA study impact credibility of the statements made in the TUA Supplemental that are not supported by evidence and documented analysis. (for ex: system of systems would have prevented the 2014 release; committed to secondary containment by 2045 without a clear plan or clear discussion on what the commitment means).

- Lack of information sharing is delaying progress.
- We need clarity on the plan for secondary containment and the related implications for the technical work and BAPT review process as defined under the AOC.